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I. THE PROBLEM: DISCRIMINATION AGAINST FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN
IN RENTAL HOUSING IN SAN FRANCISCO

A. Evidence of Discrimination Against Children

1. Many rental ads in the newspapers say "No Children" or "Adults Only". Even if this is not stated, when apartment-seekers phone, they are often told, "Sorry, no children".

2. Agencies serving families testify that housing discrimination against children is a major problem.

3. Mothers testify of their problem in finding a place to live because they have a child.

4. The 1973 Vacancy Survey by the Department of City Planning found that, of buildings with three or more units:
   - 50% DO NOT ACCEPT CHILDREN
   - 6% ACCEPT CHILDREN IN SOME UNITS
   - 2% ACCEPT CHILDREN OF SOME AGES
   - 40% ACCEPT CHILDREN IN ALL UNITS

B. Because of the Housing Shortage, There Is No Free Market Operating

1. 67% of San Francisco's housing units are renter-occupied; 33% are owner-occupied.

2. Only 33% of San Francisco's housing units are single-family homes;
   - 13% are in two-flat buildings
   - 10% are in three-or four-unit buildings
   - 44% are in buildings with 5 or more units

3. In 1972 there was a net increase of only 7 single-family homes.
   There was a net loss of 76 units in 2-flat buildings
   There was a net loss of 42 units in 3-flat buildings
There was a net gain of:

132 units in 4-unit buildings
0 units in buildings with 5-9 apartments
263 units in buildings with 10-19 apartments
560 units in buildings with 20 or more apartments

4. 68% of the households in San Francisco consist of 1 or 2 persons.

Of all households in San Francisco,

37.4% are 1 person
30.7% are 2 persons
12.9% are 3 persons
8.6% are 4 persons
4.9% are 5 persons
2.7% are 6 persons
1.5% are 7 persons
1.2% are 8 or more persons

5. The average number of persons per household in San Francisco has been decreasing.

In 1940 it was 2.80
In 1950 it was 2.70
In 1960 it was 2.44
In 1970 it was 2.34

6. The vacancy rate in San Francisco was 2.6% according to the 1973 Vacancy Survey by the Department of City Planning; whereas a vacancy rate of 5% is considered the minimum required to allow for normal mobility. (This vacancy survey was done during the summer, when there are apt to be more vacancies than at other times of the year.) The vacancy rates were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studios</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-bedroom units</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-bedroom units</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-or more bedroom units</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Because of the housing shortage, especially of housing suitable for families with children, there is no free market operating in the housing field. Qualified families discriminated against because of children can not readily find another acceptable place in the City to live.

C. San Francisco's Rent Level is One of the Highest in the Nation


At 20% of family income, half of San Francisco's families could pay only up to $175 for rent.

At two times family income, half of San Francisco's families could pay only up to $21,000 for a house.
2. 47% of San Francisco renter households are paying 25% or more of their income for rent. (ABAG's Study of Bay Area Housing Needs)


4. There are almost no places with two or more bedrooms for rent in the private market, especially for low or moderate income families.

The 1973 Vacancy Survey found only 572 two-bedroom places for rent.

105 were for less than $150 a month
38 were for $150-$174
27 were for $175-$199
228 were for $200-$249
70 were for $250-$299
64 were for $300 or more

The 1973 Vacancy Survey found only 158 places with three or more bedrooms for rent.

0 were for less than $150 a month
64 were for $150-$174
1 was for $175-$199
24 were for $200-$299
66 were for $300 or more

II. Consequences of Child Discrimination to Children, Families and the City

1. Discrimination in rental housing against children cuts down on the already short supply of decent housing for families with children.

2. If families cannot find decent housing they can afford, they either move out of the City, or live in inadequate housing and pay more than they can afford.

3. As a rule, white families are better able than minority families to move out of the City to obtain better housing. Minority families, as a rule, have to stay where they are or move where they can in the City, even if the housing is unsatisfactory, crowded, and high-priced.

Between the 1960 and 1970 Census, San Francisco lost 94,000 Whites and gained 37,000 Nonwhites in net migration. There are many components in this change; one of them is the availability of satisfactory family housing.

4. In low-income neighborhoods of San Francisco, Black and Spanish-speaking families pay more for less housing than Whites in the same neighborhood.

A study of families with male heads of household, based on the 1970 Census, by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, shows that in low-income neighborhoods of San Francisco:
The median family income was $8,668 for Whites; $8,064 for Blacks; $7,780 for Spanish-speaking.

The median housing expense was $117 for Whites; $130 for Blacks; and $113 for Spanish-speaking.

26% of the Whites; 32% of the Blacks; and 29% of the Spanish-speaking paid more than 25% of their income for housing.

Even so, 5% of the White families, 16% of the Black families, and 24% of the Spanish-speaking families lived in crowded conditions.

5. Between 1960 and 1970, San Francisco lost 15,848 children under 5 years of age. This is a loss of 26.9% of this age group compared to 14.5% in the Bay Area as a whole.

San Francisco lost 8,625 children from 5 to 14 years old, a loss of 8.8%, compared to a gain in this age group in the Bay Area of 14.2%

There are many components in these changes; one of them is the availability of satisfactory family housing.

6. Discrimination against children may have additional effects on children, families, and the City.

It may create adverse psychological feelings of rejection in some children.

Poor housing and neighborhood conditions and the feeling of not being wanted may contribute to juvenile delinquency and other problems of childhood and youth.

Child discrimination contributes to the decrease and changing composition of the City's school population.

Fewer families reduce that part of the population that is likely to be most stable and concerned with the City's future.

Fewer children growing up in San Francisco mean fewer adults with the ties and associations of childhood and youth.

III. Many Property Owners Now Rent Successfully to Families With Children

1. According to the 1970 Census, there were 69,670 families with children under 18 in San Francisco.

2. Even if the number of families with children were to increase in San Francisco, there would not be families with children in every house, flat and apartment in the City.

Of the 295,174 households in the City in 1970,

130,738 were unrelated individuals

94,766 were related adults 18 years or older

69,670 were families with children under 18
3. According to the background statistics of the 1973 Vacancy Survey by the Department of City Planning, some landlords accept children and some landlords do not accept children in every size of units; in every size of building; and at every rental range.

But most places that accept children are already occupied. There are very few places available for rent that accept children.

4. Property owners who rent to children say it works because their rights and problems in renting to people with children are the same as their rights and problems in renting to people without children.

The problems are people problems.

The rights are lawful tenant standards and screening; and rental agreements and regulations, including requirements of deposits, rent payments, cleanliness, safety, no damage to property, and no disturbance of other tenants.

IV. SOME SOLUTIONS THE CITY CAN EFFECT

1. Adopt the ordinance introduced by Supervisor Quentin Kopp to prohibit discrimination in rental housing against families with children.

2. Fund enforcement of the ordinance.

3. Adopt measures to preserve and improve existing family neighborhoods at rents and prices residents can afford.

4. Adopt measures to increase the supply of family housing, especially for families with low and moderate incomes.
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Statement on the Failure of the Board of Supervisors to Prohibit Housing Discrimination Against Families With Children

The Human Rights Commission is shocked at the defeat by the Board of Supervisors on March 18th of the ordinance to prohibit discrimination against families with children in rental housing in San Francisco.

We are shocked because we have heard Supervisors speak over and over again of the overriding need to keep families in San Francisco.

We are shocked because the Supervisors have declared, in the Resolution establishing the Fair Housing Planning Committee, that the "the City and County of San Francisco has an obligation to develop methods for providing equal access to housing for all its residents in all areas the city and to analyze and correct policies which result in segregated residential patterns".

We are shocked because the Supervisors require city employees, even with children, to live in the City.

But when the Board of Supervisors was presented with the opportunity to take one specific step in the direction of carrying out these policies, only three supervisors voted Yes. We thank Supervisor Kopp, who introduced the ordinance; Supervisor Mendelsohn, who co-sponsored it; and Supervisor Pelosi, Chairman of the Planning, Housing, and Development Committee, which recommended a Do Pass vote.

We commend the long list of parents and community, neighborhood, civic, labor, religious, and child-serving organizations who wrote letters and who testified to the critical nature of the problem at three Committee hearings since last November.

The problem remains. The problem of a decent place for families with children to live in San Francisco has not gone away because eight Supervisors voted No. The Human Rights Commission urges the Board of Supervisors to reconsider this measure.

We believe the mothers and organizations that supported this ordinance will continue to seek a solution. The Human Rights Commission offers its assistance in their search.